

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE TO ENQUIRE INTO THE ALLEGED 223
ATROCITIES COMMITTEE ON THE DEPRESSED CLASSES
OF THE RAMNAD DISTRICT

1st November 1932]

Noes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. The hon. Khan-Bahadur Sir Mahomed Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 11. Mr. S. H. Slater. |
| 2. „ Sir Archibald Campbell. | 12. „ T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. |
| 3. „ Mr. H. G. Stokes. | 13. Khan Sahib Syed Taj-ud-din Sahib Bahadur. |
| 4. „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 14. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa Bahadur. |
| 5. The hon. Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 15. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi. |
| 6. „ Diwan Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 16. Raja of Bobbili. |
| 7. Mr. C. E. Jones. | 17. Zamindar of Mirzapuram. |
| 8. „ J. A. Thorne. | 18. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. |
| 9. „ H. M. Hood. | 19. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. |
| 10. „ R. Madanagopal Nayudu. | 20. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti. |
| | 21. Zamindar of Kirlampudi. |
| | 22. Mr. R. Foulkes. |

Ayes 42. Noes 22.

The resolution was carried.

(4) TEMPLE ENTRY FOR DEPRESSED CLASSES.

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“ Mr. President, I now rise to move the following resolution: 1-15 p.m.

‘ This Council recommends to the Government that they may be pleased—

- (1) to recognize the strong and growing public feeling in the Hindu community that disabilities hitherto imposed by usage on certain classes of the community in regard to social intercourse and common worship at temples should be removed and justice rendered to them,*
- (2) to take advantage of the great impetus given in this respect by the settlement arrived at, at Poona among the leaders of the communities and the consequent agitation in the country that places of public worship should be thrown open to the so-called Depressed Classes, and*
- (3) to bring up legislation setting at rest and removing, if necessary, the doubts and disabilities which trustees and other persons holding authority in the administration of Hindu temples feel in regard to throwing them open to the said classes, with necessary safeguards for the making of regulations for maintaining order and cleanliness in temples and also the performance of ceremonies according to the usage of the temples.’*

“ Mr. President, this resolution is not being brought forward by me as a mere pious wish to admit our depressed brethren into temples. If this resolution is accepted by the House, I mean to go on with legislation in this respect also, if the Government do not seem to do it. Because, Sir, I do feel that the time has come when we must recognize

[Dr. P. Subbarayan]

[1st November 1932]

the growing public feeling in this country and also we must recognize the sentiment of our depressed brethren. We cry hoarse about nationalism and nationality. I would like to ask hon. Gentlemen sitting on the other side as well as my hon. Friends on this side of the House whether this cry is going to be only of nationalism for ourselves, so that we, the higher castes, may dominate this country, or is it going to be a common nationalism by which we are all going to be one with the growing sentiment of our depressed brethren that their place in the Hindu community should be recognized? I do not think we can get away from the fact that in spite of all that has been done during the last half a century by reformers in this country, we, caste-Hindus, have not done our duty to our depressed brethren (Hear, hear). I really admire our depressed brethren for having accepted the Poona Pact. I think they did it in order to save the life of one of the greatest of our countrymen, and for that we, caste-Hindus, owe them a deep debt of gratitude. And if we are really going to pay back that deep debt, I feel we can only do it by recognizing their right to be classed among the Hindus. It is really strange that, in spite of domination for centuries, our depressed brethren have chosen to call themselves Hindus, and have remained in the Hindu community. It shows the sentiment that runs among them and it shows the strong root that the Hindu religion has in their minds. Therefore, in return for such strong feelings on their part, I feel it is up to us caste-Hindus, to satisfy their sentiment to worship at the shrine—the same right that other Hindus possess. I have had the good fortune to work in connexion with this, and I can assure hon. Members of this House that there is really a strong public feeling in this regard; but there are few orthodox people in this land who want to oppose this and we have even heard it said, Mr. President, both on the platform and in the Press that ‘we would rather not have democracy than have our temples sacrilegied by the entry of these depressed classes.’ That only shows that these orthodox people are afraid of the coming of democracy, because they feel that with the coming of democracy their entrenched positions are bound to disappear. I think that is the strongest argument for democracy—that these people want to tyrannize over these castes, is really the strongest argument for Self-Government in this country.

“Mr. President, we have heard it said that the Agamas do not provide for the entry of these classes into the temples. I am myself not well acquainted with Sanskrit, but I have had them read out to me by people who understand Sanskrit. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: Thank God)—by people like my friend behind who, I hope, will thank God and ask God to see that their opinions are changed. (Laughter.) The word used in the Agamas, Mr. President, is ‘chandala.’ Anyone may be a chandala in the sense in which it is used in the Sanskrit text. In the Sanskrit text, the word ‘Panchama’ is never used at all. Therefore, what the Agamas provide for is the non-entry of unclean people entering temples. That is what I understand by the word ‘chandala.’ Therefore, Mr. President, the Agamas do not—whatever may be the opinion of the orthodox people—provide for Panchamas not

1st November 1932] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

entering temples. They only provide that people belonging to all communities who are unclean, who do not go into the shrine with the purity of mind that is necessary, should not enter the temples. In other words, what is provided for is not non-entry by Panchamas, but non-entry by people who are not of clean habits. I think my friend Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar will be able to tell us that, in the Madura temples, Europeans and Muhammadans and certain others have been allowed to a certain extent. I cannot say why our depressed brethren who call themselves Hindus and who follow the Hindu religion should not have the right to enter the temples.

“ I would like to ask my hon. Friend, the Chief Minister, who is really in charge of the portfolio of Religious Endowments—because the objection that is put forward by the trustees whom I have consulted over this matter is that section 40 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act provides that if custom and usage as understood generally is violated, the trustee may be removed from office—why he should not take up this matter. The trustees tell us that with all the goodwill they possess and with all idea of allowing such entry by the depressed brethren, they dare not do it, because this section 40 stands in their way. I would therefore like to ask the hon. the Minister who is also the Leader of the Justice Party, why he, as the leader of a democratic party in this country that has stood for justice and equality for all communities, should not bring legislation with a view to get rid of this section 40 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act and give permission to our depressed brethren to enter temples, so that it may be made possible for trustees not to quote section 40 of the Endowments Act against such entry. There is no doubt, Mr. President, that there is a great impetus in this country given to this movement of having our depressed brethren admitted into temples. People like Mr. Kelappan have been prepared to lay down their lives in this cause. I am sure our depressed brethren will understand that there are caste-Hindus who are prepared even to lay down their lives in order to get for them this right. It is therefore necessary that we, caste-Hindus in this House, should unanimously support this resolution, so that the right of these classes to be recognized as Hindus in all respects and not merely for counting of numbers in order to make the proportion of the Hindu community large, may be accepted by all. (Mr. Hameed Khan: ‘Hear, hear’.) I hear my friend, Mr. Hameed Khan, crying ‘Hear, hear.’ I am not now really thinking of Hindu and Muslim in this connexion. What I am thinking of is that Hindus who claim to be the largest majority in this country, if they want to count among that majority the depressed brethren, they should give them all the rights that belong to the Hindus. Otherwise, I think it is time that they excluded them from the counting which they make in order to prove to the world at large the largeness of the Hindu community. Such a step will go a long way towards the unification of the Hindu community. The Hindu community, as has been objected to by our Muslim brethren, is really divided into many castes and there exist many social evils, and it is time that we tried to improve our posi-

[Dr. P. Subbarayan] [1st November 1932]

tion by getting rid of ancient customs. I do not think even the Agamas ought to stand in the way of getting rid of customs which public opinion has begun to feel are out-of-date, and therefore facilities ought to be given for removing such pernicious customs.

“ It has been asked by many of my friends whether it is necessary to have legislation passed in order to do this. I have already quoted section 40 of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act. Besides, the general law of the land about custom would apply unless the legislature is going to take away the force of custom by passing legislation to the effect that these classes have a right of entry into temples as Hindus. It is also necessary, as I said before, Mr. President, that doubts in the minds of trustees should be removed in order to allow this being done. I know there is fear among the orthodox community that this legislation may be rushed through. I may assure them that if sanction is given to this resolution, I am prepared to circulate any bill that I may prepare for public opinion. But I want it to be understood that we must have the right to introduce this legislation. If such a feeling is expressed by this House on this resolution, it would facilitate the Government giving sanction for such a measure. Otherwise, the Government may feel that the passing of such a measure would lead to disorder. If, however, they now begin to learn that the majority of this House is in favour of such legislation, I am sure the Government themselves will think twice before turning down any legislation of the kind.

“ Let not hon. Members run away with the idea that the moment this resolution is passed, people are going to lead members of the depressed classes into the temples. That is not the underlying idea of this resolution; the idea lying behind it is that we should create public opinion in order to bring this about, that that public opinion ought to be created as quickly as possible, and every effort ought to be made by people interested in the Poona Pact and the uplift of our depressed brethren to bring about this result. Let not hon. Members also run away with the idea that there is any intention of coercion behind this resolution. We do not want to use any coercion; we do not want to do anything which will militate against law and order. On the other hand, it is the intention of the sponsors of this resolution to see that public opinion is quickly created in favour of the entry of these classes into temples and when such opinion is ready, there may not be obstacles put in the way of the trustees who are willing to carry out that opinion by allowing these communities into the temples. I would therefore urge this resolution for the serious consideration of hon. Members of this House and I would like to have this resolution passed unanimously, if unanimity could be obtained.”

After Lunch (2-30 p.m.)

* Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGAM CHETTIYAR:—“ Sir, I beg to second the motion before the House. It is unnecessary for me to speak

1st November 1932] [Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar]

about the rationale of the resolution that is brought before you. It seems to me that it is unreasonable to call a man a Hindu and then say that he is not entitled to go and worship God, the worship of which is supposed to give him his religion. It is most unfortunate that we, in this country, have been developing—I do not know for how long—it may be for centuries—the system of gradation of race and caste in everything. In almost everything we have got the system of caste which has been ruling for centuries and putting things on the basis of this gradation which even those who live in this country and under this very system of caste could not easily understand. It is very unfortunate that these depressed classes should have been treated in the way they have been. I am one of those who think that it is important that their position ought to be very much improved economically and educationally rather than by providing them this liberty of going into the temples. Entry into temples is not after all going to count very much in their progress but at the same time it will serve to show that we do not treat them differently from ourselves and that we are trying to put them on a basis of equality with ourselves. It also makes reparation for the way in which we have been dealing with them for the past so many years and shows that we are not going to perpetuate these differences any more. It is only to that extent that the motion brought before the Council and the legislation that may be brought later after this resolution is passed, will serve the purpose. I for one think that we ought to move very wholeheartedly in improving them both economically and educationally. If they are backward at the present moment it is because we are keeping them down as serfs and as people attached to the lands and passing with the land. We do not allow them to keep very much money and we do not enable them to live as they should. It is absolutely necessary that we should give them a chance and for this it is necessary that both the Government and the people should co-operate to put them in a proper position.

“ For instance we have been hearing so much about the allotment of sites for the depressed classes. But what happens actually in practice is that very few people get these sites and fewer still are those who are able to bring into cultivation the land that is given to them. Not only should we be prepared to give them the land, but we should also give them the necessary money for bringing such lands into cultivation, and also for maintaining them until they realize the first year's crop. The allotment of site alone does not go very far to help them. That is the experience and none of us are prepared to go into details and find out whether what we are doing really helps them. We feel that once a motion is brought before this Council and a grant of four or five lakhs of rupees is made for them, our business is finished. We do not even care to know how much of that money goes for the amelioration of the depressed classes. At the time of the Budget, once I drew the attention of the Council to the fact that about 25 per cent of the money that was sanctioned for the depressed classes went towards the payment of the salaries of high paid officials who were employed to look after

[Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar] [1st November 1932]

these people. We have been showing them lip sympathy. We have done very little for them to improve them economically and educationally. If they are to be socially improved, and if they are going to be classed as equals with others, they have to be improved educationally first. We have opened a number of depressed class schools and have started a number of scholarships for them. But how many? What is the total population of the depressed classes and what is the number of scholarships that have been awarded to them? I fear that in the present year even the very small number of scholarships that used to be awarded have been withdrawn. If we are sincere and if we wish to give them a chance of improving themselves economically and educationally, I do believe there ought to be very little objection to treat them on a basis of equality with us. I want that we should do justice to ourselves, if not to these people, by showing that the method in which we have been treating them in the past is not the proper method in which they ought to be treated. In that spirit I want to second the motion before the House, not because I believe that the moment we pass this resolution or the legislation that we are going to bring in is going to bring in the millenium. It is only with a view to show that we are doing justice to ourselves and that we are making reparation for the injustice that we have done to these people that we are bringing forward this resolution, and I very gladly and very strongly support it. We want to be ruled by custom. Some of these are as old as 2,000 years ago and others only 30 or 40 years old. It is very difficult for us or for anybody to say which exactly is the custom that has to be respected in a particular matter. Some want that every thing in life should be ruled by the so-called Smritis. So far as that is concerned, each party is able to quote some, that is, in its favour. The Smriti or the custom we have been adopting is not uniform. For instance, take the southern districts. In some districts the oil-mongers are not allowed to enter the temples, and a case went up to the Privy Council and they decided that oilmongers could not enter the temples and strangely enough a few miles from the place from which the case went up, the same caste people, viz., oilmongers are allowed to enter into temples. With regard to Nadars, in some districts they are allowed to go into the temples while in others they are not. The question of allowing temple entry depends upon the custom prevailing in each locality. I am told that even the highest class Nayars are not allowed to enter the Rameswaram temple. I do not think we are justified in saying that, simply because some consider certain things as sacred or ancient, we should not alter them.

‘Sir, the difficulty that was pointed out by the Mover of the resolution was that the dharmakarthas of temples are bound by custom according to the Hindu Religious Endowments Act which was passed by this very Council and they are not at liberty to allow these depressed class people into the temples. It is only to remove that difficulty that this resolution has been brought before this House. As I

1st November 1932] [Mr. T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar]

suggested at the beginning, there seems to be no argument or reason against this resolution. But in practice it is feared that in certain places, if these depressed class people are allowed to enter into the temples, there might be a breach of the peace. I would only reply that we have to do the right thing at times even at some difficulty to us. Secondly, I already referred to the gradations existing amongst us. These gradations extend not only to castes but also to the places in a temple up to which each casteman could go. For instance, only the gurukkal can go into the innermost part of the temple where the idol is seated. The next enclosure is reserved for the Brahmans, the next for the high-class Hindus, and the next for the low-class Hindus and so on. Thus, there is a gradation even among those who are admitted into the temples. Therefore, I do not see what objection there can be to the entry of the depressed classes into the temples. The dharmakarthas may, in consultation with local opinion, assign a place for the depressed classes in the temples. It is unfortunate that we have to speak of assigning places to worshippers in the temple of God; I am sure that all these will go, but until they go, I suggest that the dharmakarthas should do this, always consulting local opinion in the matter. What I suggest is not against the spirit of the present practice under which each caste has a place assigned to it in the temple. If this is done, I am sure there will be no breach of the peace and any fear entertained on that score will be merely baseless.

2-45
p.m.

“The resolution, as it stands, makes provision for such a thing. I think it deals with the question only in a halting way. My friend, the Mover, speaks of the necessary safeguards and so on. We are familiar with safeguards proposed to be introduced in another sphere about which there is a strong feeling and difference of opinion. Here in this case also my hon. Friend does not want to abandon them; he wants to meet the orthodox opposition by introducing the necessary safeguards. If the orthodox people want to stress the point with regard to safeguards, they will have plenty of opportunity to do so when the Bill comes before the Council. Leaving that aside, I do not think there can be any objection to the resolution. I have great pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. Friend.”

* Rao Sahib V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—“I beg to move that—
‘after the word “Poona” the words “and the Bombay Conference” be added’.”

“Sir, the discussions that took place at Poona among the leaders was confined only to the Premier’s award and the representation of the depressed classes in the legislatures. It was only at the Bombay Conferences that took place both before and after the Poona Pact was entered into that the social side of the problem was discussed and conclusions arrived at. So, I thought it advisable to make this small amendment in order to make the matter clear.”

Mr. H. M. JAGANNATHAM:—“I second it.”

[1st November 1932]

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—"I have no objection to the amendment; I accept it."

* Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"Mr. President, Sir, no one at this time of the day would question the sentiment underlying the resolution of the hon. Member. We cry for democracy, nationalism and Swaraj; we claim equality between man and man and the same political rights for all. How can we with any sense of responsibility say that those who are with us as Hindus should be denied the right which other Hindus exercise? That is why I have always been fighting for the removal of untouchability. To me temple entry is a very minor problem. The root cause of this prohibition against temple entry must be approached in a spirit of devotion for the cause. Temple entry alone is nothing because several caste people even are denied entry into the temple in my place. There are castes with whom we associate but are not allowed to enter the temples. In the south also there are very important castes who were not allowed to enter temples at one stage. Some of them, by economic improvement and by making themselves useful members of the society in many ways have been enabled to enter temples. There are castes in South India who are said to be outcastes; they came from other places; they have now become dharma-karthas by their wealth and enterprise. The root cause of their degradation is their economic position and once you and I help the depressed classes to elevate themselves economically, the problem of temple entry will be easily solved. The hon. the Mover of the resolution has suggested one method. He says: remove the obstacles to temple entry by legislation. For instance, the Hindu Religious Endowments Act does not permit trustees of temples to go against usage and permit depressed classes to enter temples. Therefore he says: pass a law permitting the trustees to do this. It is no doubt one of the means of achieving our object, but I should say it is not an effective method. It all depends on the circumstances in each district. While I am anxious that all obstacles in the way of this reform should be removed, I urge that the problem must be approached in a spirit of sincere devotion to the cause of the uplift of these classes. I do not agree with the reform which is proposed in this resolution. The accumulated sins of ages, the injustices done to these classes for years and years, cannot be removed by a stroke of the pen and attempted to be set right in a month. How can there be such a social revolution producing such far-reaching social changes in a day? As my hon. Friend the Mover has suggested, public opinion must be educated and when it has expressed itself sufficiently strongly, any legislation that may be introduced thereafter will be an effective one. But in this case there are grumblings and protests all over. I do not say it is yet universal, but there is a certain amount of strong opposition to this social legislation. Let us educate public opinion still more and bring round these opponents to our way of thinking—that we should afford every facility to the depressed classes and should not place any obstacles in the way of their entering our temples and worshipping there like other Hindus.

1st November 1932] [Sir A. P. Patro]

“ My hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Pillai, said that this question of the removal of untouchability was discussed at the Bombay Conference and not in Poona. I myself wanted to table an amendment like the one he has just now moved. It was decided at the Bombay Conference that this question must be tackled in all its aspects and that public opinion must be educated. It is only one and a half months since this question has become a live issue. Given some more time, the opponents of this reform will be convinced of the unwisdom and sin of their opposition to allow a section of the Hindus into the Hindu temples. I suggest to the hon. Mover that he should not proceed in this precipitous manner and that ample opportunity should be given to the country to discuss this question. There is no use of coercing public opinion. Every time a social reform is proposed, however necessary and harmless it may be, it has been the pastime of the orthodox people to quote certain Agamas and other Sastras. Heaven knows what these are; even educated caste-Hindus like me are ignorant of them. It has been the privilege of certain privileged classes to study them and interpret them. Sastras were quoted against the abolition of sati; it was said that sati was an act of great virtue and according to the Sastras, the poor struggling women burnt alive on the funeral pyre of her husband went straight to heaven. The same story was told when the Widow Remarriage Bill was under consideration. It was a purely optional legislation and even against that Sastras were quoted. The cry was raised that the Government was interfering with religion and there would be a revolution in the country.

“ Even when the legislation with regard to prevention of child marriages—otherwise known as the Sarda Act—was passed, this cry was raised. Of course that Act was passed. But what is its effect? To-day you find marriages of little babies going on. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: ‘ They are punished.’) They are punished in very rare cases. You and I connive at these marriages. (Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetti: ‘ I did not connive.’) If they happen to be our relations, we make no report. Look at the condition that has been imposed in that Act. You must deposit a sum of Rs. 100 for the purpose of lodging a complaint under the Act. It prevents many people who wish to make complaints from doing so. Every politician of every shade thought that it was absolutely necessary that child marriages should be prevented and the Act was passed only recently. What is the effect? We hear of many unrestricted marriages of children. Therefore I say that in a matter of social legislation, you must know what the real opinion is in the country. But even if a certain section oppose a measure, if there is a strong sense of feeling among the majority of the people, you must get through the necessary legislation. But I am not one of those who would feel diffident to introduce any social legislation, if a small section is vociferous against it. But you must have the good sense and right judgment to estimate the opinion in the country properly and then you must reflect it in the legislature. I entirely sympathize with the object the hon. Mover of the resolution

3 p.m.

[Sir A. P. Patro]

[1st November 1932]

has in view. I would make a suggestion that he should not proceed with any legislation; he must be cautious after the warning in the case of the Prevention of Child Marriages Act.

"I may say that this problem of temple entry is not so important to me as that of the removal of untouchability. Once in a direct manner you take up that problem, economic elevation, once you make up your mind to improve the social condition of the depressed classes and remove untouchability, the question of temple entry will be of no consequence. Therefore, attack the problem, not from the top, but from the bottom. In the rural areas what do you find to-day? My hon. Friend from Coimbatore pictured to us the position and condition of people in the *cheris* in the villages. People who are doing social service and who wish to see how far they can provide facilities for these people, how far they can carry comfort to the homes of these miserable people, and how far they can introduce cheerfulness into their families, know the difficulties these classes are living under. In regard to land, these unfortunate people are treated worse than cattle. There are still places where land is conveyed from one person to another with the person on the land. What is the use of temple entry to these people? The most effective way in which you can help them is to create a sense of self-respect in them, to create a sense of humanity for them and to emancipate them from the present economic position in which the caste-Hindus have placed them. The problem is one of social and economic improvement. It has nothing to do with religion. Temple entry is a very small problem compared with the real issue before us. What is the use of allowing these people to enter the temples unless they are emancipated? Even if they are allowed to go there, it will be only a mere academic problem of satisfying the political sentiments of some people. Will it bring them any kind of happiness or peace in their homes? Will it take them out of the surroundings in which you have placed them? That is the real problem.

"I do not know whether my hon. Friend has bestowed any thought on the question of these safeguards. You say that safeguards have to be provided; you want to give power to caste-Hindus to see that their own interests are protected. You want to provide rules and regulations as to what clothes should be worn and what conditions should be satisfied for entering into the temples. Safeguards and rules have to be framed for the purpose of determining what kind of ceremonies should be permitted and under what conditions *dakshana* can be offered. Then where is freedom for these people to enter into the temples for worshipping God there? If you are going to curtail some of their privileges, if you are going to impose restrictions on the liberty of the depressed classes, what is the use of allowing them to enter the temples? You do not impose the same restrictions on caste-Hindus. Just as any caste-Hindu is allowed to go into the inner portions of the temples, so also the depressed classes should be allowed to go there. A member of the depressed classes must be able to make the same offerings as a caste-Hindu. He should have the right of having *archanas*

1st November 1932]

[Sir A. P. Patro]

and *abishekams* performed as any caste-Hindu. Why do you want to impose these restrictions, in the name of democracy, in the name of swaraj, upon these poor people because they happen to be socially and economically inferior to you at present? These safeguards which you want to provide will take away the blessing which you confer on them, of entering into the temples. I wonder what safeguards are going to be imposed. I do not know why the resolution refers to such safeguards. I do not know why there should be safeguards provided in such a social legislation as this. Rules and regulations will be framed to the effect that depressed classes should not go beyond the Dwajasthambam but should remain near it and make their offerings. I say 'remove all these restrictions.' Let not this find a place in the recommendation that is going to be made by this Council; there should be no safeguards. While I sympathize with the principle underlying the resolution, I am not in favour of providing safeguards; nor do I say that by legislation alone real salvation would be given to the depressed classes. This is only one of the means by which you want to secure equality for the depressed classes, but the more important remedy is their economic emancipation first, the improvement of surroundings and the creation of self respect."

* Mr. F. BIRLEY:—"Mr. President, Sir, I would like to say that my community naturally has the very greatest sympathy with any effort to uplift the depressed classes, and to remove the religious and social disabilities under which they labour. At the same time I am very definitely of opinion that such efforts cannot take effect in a brief period and I would strongly deprecate any attempt at coercion and direct action which may result in breaches of the peace. With this qualification I think I am expressing the general opinion of my community when I say that the resolution now before the House has our very greatest sympathy."

* Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Sir, I am sure the House has listened with care and attention and with interest to the speech of my hon. Friend, Sir Patro. We read very recently that our brethren—the depressed classes—commissioned him to represent them and their interests somewhere. I do not know whether he is a friend from whom they would like to be saved after hearing his speech, or whether they would like to be associated with him further. That is a matter which I would leave for them to decide among themselves."

"I think the resolution moved by my hon. Friend, Dr. Subbarayan, is a modest one and should meet with our general assent. The cry that religion is in danger is not a new one at all. My hon. Friend, Mr. Patro, said that it was raised even as long ago when attempts were made to abolish *sati*. Even in our presidency when the Hindu Religious Endowments Act was on the anvil, that cry was raised. When the Tirupati Bill also was on the anvil, the same thing was said. When the Sarda Act was under consideration, the same cry was raised. I do not agree with my hon. Friend, Mr. Patro, that this Act has been

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [1st November 1932]

of no use at all. We know that cases of breaches of the Sarda Act were taken to the Courts and the persons responsible for the offences were punished. The provisions of the Act would have been enforced more strictly, were it not for our political troubles. The Government felt somewhat nervous to enforce this Act strictly and thus add to the forces arrayed against them. That is one of the reasons why the Government have been somewhat hesitating in regard to the effective enforcement of the Act.

"I want this resolution to be passed for two reasons, both in the interest of the caste-Hindus as well as in the interests of the depressed classes. I say it is in the interest of the caste-Hindus because it would not do for them to treat the depressed classes as Hindus for one purpose and reject them for another purpose. They should not play this double game, and they should not widen the gulf between them. I think that action on the lines indicated in this resolution would be useful for the depressed classes. We all know that the temples and the idols we worship are calculated to improve our ideas of culture, etc. Animal sacrifice, offerings of toddy, etc., will not be permitted in temples like Chidambaram, Tanjore, Tirupati and other temples. These things will have ennobling influence on the depressed classes for the better. I think these people who want to go into the temples will derive benefit rather than be at a disadvantage.

"So much has been said about *sastras*. I am sure that, if the aid of the Pandits are invoked, you can find authorities both in favour of temple entry and against it. I think we need not attach very great importance to *sastras*, because, as we make progress, customs must go away to suit the changing conditions from time to time.

3-15
p.m

"I would only urge this consideration for our Hindu brethren to bear in mind, that is, that those who believe in *sastras* and accept them as authorities base their objections on the impurity of these poor people. I think, Sir, ignorance can certainly be fought by propaganda and education. Surely, the Gods that are being worshipped are capable of taking care of their purity, and God will not be polluted by the approach of any of the creatures that God himself has created. I therefore wish earnestly to associate myself with the proposition moved by my hon. Friend."

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am extremely thankful to Dr. Subbarayan for having brought forward this resolution before the Council. The resolution itself is very mild and moderate. No wonder that Dr. Subbarayan who was taking great interest in all the communities when he was a Minister thought it best to bring forward this resolution immediately an opportunity came. I am however very sorry that my Friend, Sir Patro, took the attitude that he did and spoke in a rather patronizing way. Adi-Dravidas should not be looked upon in a patronizing way; we should not say 'let us give them this, let us give them that.' Only this morning the resolution regarding the suffix 'Achari' was forced on us; and the

1st November 1932] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

Kammalas, Kamsalis and others got their right recognized. Now, these people whom we call Adi-Dravidas have also got a right to claim from us, and they must enjoy the privileges which other communities enjoy. Somebody referred to the Agamas. I say these Agamas are interpolations. I do not think any Agamas existed 5,000 years ago. The first time we hear of castes in our country is the time of the Tholkapiam. Don't we see in the Mahabharata that great men, children of the carpenters and the fishermen belonged to one community. Tholkapiam is the first book that speaks of castes in our country.

"Therefore, to talk of Agamas and other things is all irrelevant; what we find in Agamas are all interpolations. The Agamas must be of recent origin. These interpolations might not have existed originally.

"I cannot understand how people belonging to the community in which our Tiruvalluvar was born have been reduced to this condition. I think there should have been some religious or political tyranny underlying all this. It cannot be otherwise. Those Adi-Dravidas ought to have been political or religious heads and perhaps their opponents wanted to bring them down. You know it has been so in all countries and all ages. I know how the Jains were treated by the Hindu community. Whenever and wherever they found opposition, they tried their best to tyrannize the opposing people. Can any decent religion tolerate such tyranny? Can anybody think of a religion which compels those Hindus to be only with a piece of cloth about them; which cannot allow an Adi-Dravida to come within ten yards of the houses of the Hindus, which says that if he speaks a word against a high caste Hindu his tongue should be cut off. Is it Hinduism? Let not people of other religion mistake our religion as allowing all these things. Our religion is a most tolerant one. According to Hindu religion and philosophy there is no distinction of caste or creed. Sir Patro may think otherwise, with all his experience. From the very ancient times we had not distinction of caste or creed. Tartars came to our land; we absorbed them. Mongols were thus absorbed and so were Greeks. It was Britons conquering Normans. I am speaking the truth; I am speaking history; and that has been the feature of the Hindus or I may say the then Indians. All people, who tried to uplift the down-trodden, occupied a very high place in the religions of Sri Ramanuja and Sankara. Our Tiruvalluvar whose Kural is the book for all ages and for all people in the world belonged to the Adi-Dravida community. The high caste Hindus are now learning Kural; but the community which produced that Tiruvalluvar is insulted. Kural, Sir, is the moral code of the South Indian communities. How is it that that community of our law-giver and moral preceptor has been brought to this position? Surely there is something underneath all this. Our sages have written against such a distinction being made as between caste and caste. Sankara spoke against it; Ramanuja for whom I have the greatest respect, spoke against this. Ramanuja took all the people into the temple. One example of how Ramanuja brought an alwar to great

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [1st November 1932]

prominence was that of the great Thiruppana Alwar. What about Sankara? What about Ramanuja? What about our Aruvathumuvars? We read and worship them without knowing the real meaning. It is only to set right society from degeneration that prophets arose—Lord Buddha, Lord Jesus, and then Muhammad. You may call them prophets, but I call them Lords. It was only when society was torn to pieces such prophets arose in all countries, and they all said one word—the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. When Ramanuja was asked whether he would go to hell by giving the mantram to all people, he replied; “let all these people by learning the mantram go to heaven; I will go to hell, for saving their souls.” Having had all these people in our community, we are now discussing whether we should or should not pass this resolution. Sir Patro said that this question of temple entry is before us only for the past one and a half months, and he says that, in spite of his 55 years of life. What about Sri Ramanuja who got temple entry to Melkotta temple at least for three days in a year; about Chaitanya and Dayananda Saraswathi who fought for the equal rights of all the communities. Recently there was Mr. G. Subrahmanya Ayyar who protested against inequalities. Then there is Sir R. Venkataratnam. I was under the influence of all these gentlemen in my younger days. They all attempted to level up society and democratize religion. Even now, Sir R. Venkataratnam has a number of Adi-Dravida children around him. I believe it was Mr. G. Subrahmanya Ayyar who was the first social reformer. For generations we had before us the temple entry question. But now Sir Patro is saying that we hear such talk only for the past one and a half months. Once we created a scene in the Sri Parthasarathiswami temple some years ago when I was a student in the B.A. class. Our Hindu society is in such a state that at present there is no Hindu majority community. I am saying this to all the gentlemen here that there is no Hindu majority community as such at present. The Hindu majority community is composed of a number of minority communities. Among them there are no intermarriages. Sir Patro and myself cannot intermarry (Laughter). I mean of Sir Patro's family and those of mine. Most probably, if he comes to my house, the old women will say ‘Do not sit and eat with Sir Patro; I will send you out of the community if you do so.’ Vice versa will be done if I go to his house. That is the present state of our society. Any one community has nothing to do with the other communities. In fact, one can easily find out which is the majority community within the Hindu communities. It is the Adi-Dravida community; that is the only community which consists of several millions of people and of all the many small communities of Hindu community that is the largest one. And to that community we do not want to give all the privileges they deserve. It is the duty of all of us, Hindus, to go about and tell the high caste people that all these people belong to our religion, one and the same religion, and that they should have the same privileges as ourselves. Sir Patro says that the question is a month and a half old. What about Sadasiva Ayyar, Seshagiri Ayyar, G. Subrahmanya Ayyar and a host of other people who

1st November 1932] [Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

have been working in this behalf for a long time. Sages like Ramanuja have been working centuries ago towards the levelling up of society by striking at the very root of evils of society and religion. And they were not successful. Even Ramanuja had to run away at one time. By the by I have also to impress upon my friend, the hon. Sir Patro, Nandanar's temple entry. So this struggle for temple entry has been going on in our land for ages now. What Ramanuja and others did not succeed in doing in those days the non-Brahman party did. Our party creed was 'Give them political status.' Other self-respect and other privileges will automatically go to them. The other day in this Council I said: 'If an Izhava was being oppressed by the other communities in a certain locality, make an Izhava a Judge or Collector in that locality, surely the Izhava will be better treated thereafter.' That is what I say now, and that is what our party said: Give them political power. My leader, that great man the Raja of Panagal, said so when he was in the Legislative Assembly. He said: 'Call a man Harīdas—that is a servant of God—he will not be honoured by our society and you will not allow him to approach you even within ten yards of your house. But if he becomes a Christian, a Jacob or a Joseph, then surely you will call him to sit in your own table because he assumes the religion of the rulers.' Political power gives him that right. Non-Brahman movement started with that principle. We wanted political privileges and rights for the Adi-Dravidas and the result of it is we see capable and eminent men from the community sitting in the Council. Adi-Dravidas have been tenaciously clinging to the Hindu religion for over two thousand years in spite of oppression and suppression they have been subjected to. They have been all along Hindus—that is a matter for our admiration. Politically we have achieved great results. One of the very Adi-Dravidas whom Hindus had not been allowing to come within ten yards of their houses was received by the King-Emperor in the Buckingham Palace; people like my friend, Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan, have been in the Round Table Conference. Politically we have achieved enough for the Adi-Dravidas. We need not hereafter tell them to do this and that; they automatically, economically and socially are bound to rise. The whole question now centres round joint electorate or separate electorate. I was for separate electorate. I am now thinking whether separate electorate will do them any good at this stage. If they are to have a joint electorate, the high caste Hindus will have to go and beg of them for votes. We will take care of their interest both in this Council and outside. I am very glad to find that they are going to have joint electorate. I congratulate Mr. Srinivasan and the other gentlemen here who went to Poona and accepted the Pact. We want the Government to give them the same privileges as they give to the other communities. Government restore Rajas and Maharajas to their posts, and it is their duty in this case, as also the duty of this Council, to see that the Adi-Dravidas are restored to their original status and privileges. We all worship at the Tiruvallur temple; why not politically worship these gentlemen here?

"After all, Sir, this is a permissive resolution. There are temple trustees who say that personally they have no objection but that the high

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar] [1st November 1932]

caste worshippers will object to such temple entry. What harm is there, I ask, if you pass this resolution? We simply allow or permit those who want to give entry to give it; there is no question of coercion. Our friend here speaks of coercion. Where is coercion here.

“ With these few words, Sir, I commend this resolution—one of the resolutions of the day—to the acceptance of this Council and hope that all will unanimously vote for this,—including Sir Patro. I am glad, Sir, that our European friend, Mr. Birley, has accepted the resolution. We must all of us vote unanimously for this resolution and show to the country that we are not behind any others in this respect. Certainly we must hasten legislation in this respect as much as possible, as the life of the greatest soul of India will be involved, if the period exceeds six months. All the present restrictions should go away root and branch within the period of six months. I support this resolution very strongly.”

3-30
p.m.

* Mr. C. R. PARTHASARATHI AYYANGAR:—“ Mr. President, Sir Patro, who thinks that everybody should follow in his foot-steps, has put a question in a guarded manner. I think that in a matter of this sort, we forget one important fact, and that is that there are laws which govern the relationship of people in every country. We have to accept them as the natural law of the country. So, if we do not treat our depressed class people as friends or persons whose aspirations we must admire, how do you expect the British Government to admire our pertinacity and our determination to achieve our goal. One of the reasons why we have not achieved freedom is that we have not given freedom to our own people. If we want freedom, we must remove the yoke which we have placed upon others. So long as there is a perpetuation of serfdom, it gives an opportunity to the British Government to say, ‘ we place the yoke which you are placing upon others.’ Though it may not be expressed point blank in so many words, yet that is the feeling in the mind of every European. He says, ‘ you want freedom, we are prepared to give you, but you remove the yoke which you have placed over the neck of the depressed classes, before you claim privileges for yourselves.’ Each community and each section, wants some privileges for itself which it wants to deny to others. If therefore, the natural law, viz., what you give to others the same will be given to you, is to be respected, if you want to move hand in hand with every class, every creed and every race, you must treat every one with cordiality. By allowing the depressed class people to enter the temples, we are not going to achieve the millennium, and make the Adi-Dravida a man of culture or the highly cultured man in this country. Certainly not. But you don’t exploit them, you don’t treat with contempt those persons who are weaker than yourselves in culture, in status, in ability and skill. If we do not treat them like that, then naturally every other nation in the world, even the people who treat us with indifference and before whom Sir Patro is going to urge our case in the third Round Table Conference, where he will have to say, ‘ we have given freedom to the Adi-Dravidas, why don’t you give us freedom for which we have been asking all these years.’ Instead of making such a bold stand, Sir Patro says, ‘ let us wait for

1st November 1932] [Mr. C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar]

some time.' The same answer, he will get at the Round Table Conference—Sir Samuel Hoare will say, 'you want to wait in the case of the Adi-Dravidas; so, until then you will have to wait also.' If you are to march quickly on the road to freedom, give those people the freedom they want and by the law of nature, you will get the freedom you want. Therefore, I would say, temple entry is only one of the ways in which we can show our consideration to the depressed classes. This is not the only occasion when this question has arisen. In Melkote, the Adi-Dravidas are given an opportunity of entering the temple for three days in a year. That has been in vogue for a century or so. Now, we are centuries ahead and we are only worse. At present, younger people are quite ready to pave the way. There are no Shastras prohibiting it. There is no Shashtra which says that a person is a Chandala and so he should not enter a temple. The only thing that is required before entering a temple is, that you have to enter it with reverence and neatness and these are the things that are absolutely necessary in the case of any one who enters a temple. We are not going to allow people who behave in a rude fashion.

"If we want to treat them as friends, and as people whom you care for, you must give them opportunities to show that we care for them, their welfare and their spiritual prosperity and that you do not neglect them. It is the index of the feeling that we have and that is the motive behind this resolution.

"There is another point also we shall have to remember. In the west, no social equality was obtained without revolution. In the east, we are doing it more carefully. The history of the French revolution and the steps they have taken for securing social and political equality show how people in the west were not tolerant. People there take the law into their own hands and they are more quick in attaining their object. They could not tolerate these things for a long time and hence the French revolution. Even the American revolution was the direct result of social revolt. Therefore, we have to take care in our own country against a repetition of such feelings. It is simply an extraordinary thing to find how our Adi-Dravidas are child-like and simple in their demands and do not revolt. If they had really the temperament of the people in the west, they would have revolted long, long ago. We should not therefore take advantage of this. It is high time that we fought social and political revolution, that we take time by the forelock and see that the persons who are depressed are not depressed any longer, that we should impress upon them that we are careful for their welfare and that one of the methods by which we care for them is that we should allow them to worship God as we worship and to show to them that before God, we are one and the same. That kind of feeling in us will have a tremendous effect. I have therefore no hesitation in saying that the effect of this resolution is far far-reaching than we imagine. First, it will advance us politically. Secondly, we avoid revolution. Both these put together, will make us feel that we have done wisely in bringing forward this resolution. With these few words, I commend the resolution for the acceptance of the House."

[1st November 1932]

* Mr. V. P. NARAYANAN NAMBIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, the resolution before the House embodied a matter of vital importance inasmuch as it aims to remove the greatest curse on Hindu religion and the most tragic blot on Hindu society. The depressed classes are admitted to be Hindus, they are 'sisters and brothers' at political gatherings, yet when water has to be drawn from a common well, when common education has to be imparted, and common worship has to be offered, the depressed classes are told, 'thus far and no further.' If temples be really the centres of religion and the abode of God, we have no right whatever to stand in the way of our co-religionists offering common worship with us to the God of us all. Why should there be division between caste and caste? Caste division in the old days was but a division of labour for the glory of the motherland. It was built up so that India might be served, each community honouring itself and finding perfect expression through some service which would be best suited to its own way of thought, its own capacity of achievement. We cannot allow what was meant to be the source of richer unity to be to-day a source of disunion, disintegration and degradation that affects the honour and progress of the motherland.

"The recent fast and penance of Mahatma Gandhi has awakened public consciousness in this matter and in many places—even in such places of orthodoxy as Kalighat, Ayodhya and Nasik—orthodoxy itself has become reconciled to temples being freely and voluntarily thrown open to the depressed classes. It is necessary to take advantage of this national awakening and rid Hinduism of a disease which sooner or later must be got rid of. All reasonable Hindus—and they form the great bulk of Hindus—believe with Mahatma Gandhi that with "human outcastes, God Himself is an outcaste." Along with my hon. Friend, Mr. K. P. Raman Menon, I have the honour to represent in this House the Hindus of Malabar. And of Malabar I can say, that the heart of Malabar to-day is against the disabilities in the way of the depressed classes. This was amply demonstrated by the fast of Mr. Kelappan and at the historic gathering which recently met at Guruvayur. Thousands of people had assembled there, men and women had come from all parts of Malabar. They with one voice resolved that Malabar which was the cradle of untouchability should also be the tomb of untouchability and demanded of the Zamorin to throw open the gates of the Guruvayur temple to the depressed classes. Malabar has realized that the depressed classes, lamentable human beings so long disinherited from their rights of humanity, are flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone.

"Mr. President, we have of late heard Swaraj for India spoken of vigorously, unceasingly and passionately; but so long as the inequalities that are sought to be removed by the resolution before the House are existent we shall be as distant from Swaraj as we were at any time in the history of this country. How can we hope for greater rights and higher privileges, how can we dream of a future free India, when depressed classes are denied by us equal opportunities, equal privileges, and equal rights? 'Unless grotesque ideas of misconceived gradations and degradations of society are given up there will not be the dawn of a

1st November 1932] [Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar]

bright era. Directly these barriers are set at naught, abiding trust in each other will be established and the depressed classes who carried the bond of centuries, will say 'Oh, caste men we trust you.' We will then establish that true democracy of Indian life by seeing that the best men shall represent the best interests of India. Then alone can we rightly claim to represent India, to represent the honour of India, the capacity of India, the ideals which India must stand for in the eyes of the world. May I therefore, in the interests of general welfare and social justice, and in the name of the great past and the glorious future of our country, appeal to this hon. House to accept this resolution."

* Mr. YAKUB HASAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, my excuse for inter-³⁻⁴⁵vening in this debate is this, that I consider the removal of untouchability ^{p.m.} to be an Indian National question and not a mere communal question of the Hindus. When Mahatma Gandhi introduced in the Congress the question of the removal of untouchability and made it a charge on the Congress, many Hindu Sabha leaders including the late Swami Shraddhanand were of the opinion that this question was a Hindu question and the Congress, of which non-Hindus are also members, should not tackle this question. I differed from them and said that this was not a mere Hindu communal question but an Indian National question. Untouchability is a blot on Indian civilization and as long as it exists, no Indian can raise his head as a civilized man, be he a Hindu or a Mussalman. As long as the notions about pollution remain in India as they are now and certain people are kept out of their social and religious rights simply because they belong to one section of the community, we cannot consider ourselves to be really civilized people. I want equality, true equality to be established in India among all peoples and that can only be established if this untouchability goes. With the removal of untouchability the ideas about pollution will also be radically changed. Because Mussalmans ruled in this country for a long time, it has become the custom to tolerate the presence of the Mussalmans here. But socially Mussalmans are as much untouchable among the orthodox Hindus as the untouchable classes themselves. There are many Hindu restaurants in Madras where no Mussalman is allowed to enter. Sometime ago there was no such disability as this, but now I find after all the progress that has been made this state of things has come to exist. I went to one restaurant with a Hindu friend, and the proprietor told my friend 'Please don't bring any Muhammadans here. We will lose our customers.' They think that coming into contact with some people who do not belong to the four castes would pollute these people. That idea must be removed, and it can only be removed when the untouchability of the depressed classes is removed.

"Untouchability has got three aspects, the political, the social and the religious. Thanks to the self-sacrificing fast of Mahatma Gandhi, the political untouchability has been removed and the number of communities has been reduced by one. Hereafter, the depressed classes will not be treated as a separate community. The Hindu community will cover them all. I should wish that a day may come when community and nation would become synonymous. I want the number of these

[Mr. Yakub Hasan] [1st November 1932]

communities to be reduced and Mahatma Gandhi has reduced it and one community at least has been wiped off as a separate community. That is a great gain indeed. Mahatmaji's fast has also opened the eyes of other people. The Indian Christians are also saying that they should not be kept out and thrown out of touch with the Hindu community to whom they belong culturally. Religion alone should not separate them, and they want to be taken back into the fold of the Hindu community. Only they do not want entry into the temples; they have got their churches to go to. Even among the Indian Christians also the caste system is kept up. The depressed classes by becoming Christians remain depressed at the same time and the other castes also by becoming Christians retain their caste. But that is not the case with the Mussalmans. As long as this question of pollution remains, there can be no hope whatever of any social or religious reform. The caste system was nothing but an occupational system. As has been observed by others, it only represented trade divisions among the people. There was the priestly class, there was the military class, there was the mercantile class and there was the class of labourers. And those people who were doing some other work which is a dirty work, such as scavenging and other things, were considered to be unclean and kept out of the castes. The touch of them was considered pollution. Now in these days, in cities where the flush-out system has been introduced Brahmans and non-Brahmans are washing their night soil every morning. Now where is the difference between the Brahmans and the depressed class people when they do their own scavenging? Go to Broadway, a Brahman would take the measurement of your feet and put the shoes on to them. Where is the difference between the depressed class cobblers and the Brahman shoe-makers? In the skin and hide trade, not only tanned skins and hides but also raw skins and hides, there are Brahmans and non-Brahmans carrying on the trade and even handling the cow hides too. Where is the difference between the Brahman and the non-Brahman in the hide trade and these depressed classes who handle carcasses of dead animals and are considered unclean? No work can make any person unclean. Bodily cleanliness can be attained by ablutions, and if people are not allowed entry into the temples, it is on account of the pollution which these people are supposed to carry with them. Simply because certain classes go to a certain place they are said to pollute that place. That idea must be removed. Pollution comes in, not because a man belongs to a certain class, not because of his profession or trade. On account of carrying on certain profession he may have some unclean habits. So, those habits must be removed and not anything else. In the beginning of Islam, a Christian came to Medina and he went to a mosque, the only mosque that was there, and the Christian actually made water there. All the Mussalmans were naturally up in arms and they would have lynched the man. But the Prophet pacified them and ordered that mosque to be washed. The washing cleaned that mosque and washing was considered enough to clean the actual pollution that was made. And the man who innocently did this was not even made to know that he had committed a serious offence, because he was only a traveller who came to

1st November 1932] [Mr. Yakub Hasan]

that place. That is the spirit in which I want my Hindu brethren to consider this matter. In doing away with untouchability, they bring about a revolution in their ideas of cleanliness, and in their ideas of pollution. That is what is aimed at. In this resolution legislation is sought. The legislation, as far as I can understand it, is to help certain trustees who think that by custom they have to observe certain forms, though they sympathise with the question of temple entry. They have no objection to the depressed classes entering temples, but at the same time they think that they as trustees should have regard for the custom and usage and should not go against it. The proposed legislation would only enable them to allow an entry into the temples if the other worshippers have no objection to these depressed classes coming in. The Government should not raise the plea of neutrality in religious matters. It is not a question of neutrality. The Government must behave like a National Government. To-day if we had a National Government, peoples' own Government, there will not be any question of neutrality. Neutrality will not come. We will have to legislate on this matter. And you cannot say that Mussalmans should not interfere in a matter that concerns Hindus as the temple entry question is a purely Hindu question. If you find that any section of Mussalmans is being tyrannized by the other major section of Mussalmans, the Hindus would be doing their duty by interfering in the matter of Mussalmans and prevent tyranny being perpetrated against any section of Mussalmans. I feel that a tyranny is being done to a section of the Hindus and I feel it my duty as an Indian to come in and help you to remove that tyranny."

Mrs. K. ALAMELUMANGATHAYARAMMA then spoke in Tamil. The 4 p.m. following is the true English translation of the speech:—

"Mr. President, Sir, I want to speak a few words supporting Dr. Subbarayan's motion for temple-entry for the depressed classes. In God's creation all men are equal. There is no superiority or inferiority. Tiruvalluvar says in his 'Tirukkural' that all are equal at birth. The great saint, Vemanna, has spoken about the worship of God and the equality of all castes in such worship. In these days when we are pleading for the political equality of all communities, why should we make any distinction in the matter of religious worship. It is man that has created higher and lower castes, and not God. God has never said that only the higher castes are entitled to worship Him. The Saivite, Vaishnavite and other sections in the Hindu religion preach equality and cosmopolitanism. Religious teachers like Sri Sankarar, Sri Ramanujar, Ramananthar, Krishna Chaitanyar, Kabir and Nanak have preached to the people the essential equality of man. Generally, though Hindus are stated to be of a very religious temperament, they have not put into practice the teachings of their religion. Every thing has been narrowed down to custom and tradition. The differences in the matter of temple worship are really based on caste distinctions. The caste differences in our country have, it has been made clear by many, no sanction in

[Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma] [1st November 1932]

the vedas. A hundred years ago, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who had studied the four vedas, has pointed out that there is no support in the vedas for these differences. He condemned the artificial distinctions made between certain castes in the matter of the temple-worship. He established the Brahmo Samaj in which all persons, without any distinction, could pray to God. This Samaj is a great unifying force in India to-day. God who is all pervading should be worshipped by all including the Adi-Dravidas. The Adi-Dravidas should feel that they are equal to other communities. It is because caste-Hindus have been treating them as inferiors that they have embraced Christianity or Islam. The Hindu community as a whole is declining in strength and solidarity on account of these differences. It is common knowledge that when persons belonging to other religions, who are high officials, such as Governor-Generals, Governors or Collectors, enter our temples, they are given greater honours than the devotees of the Hindu religion.

“Legislation will be found to be necessary to remedy the present evils. Raja Ram Mohan Roy stopped the practice of ‘Sati’ by legislation. The orthodox Hindus were against it. When Pandit Iswarchandra Vidya Sagar brought the widow remarriage measure, orthodox Hindus opposed it. When the Civil Marriage Bill was passed, there was a similar opposition. But the cause of reform and progress triumphed. In the case of temple-entry also, legislation will be necessary, and so I support the motion and appeal to the Members to pass the resolution unanimously and enable the proper framing of legislation for the temple-entry of the depressed classes.”

* Rao Bahadur R. SRINIVASAN:—“Mr. President, Sir, the resolution is a very modest one. I say it is a modest one because it does not require the restoration of the ancient temples that belonged to us, depressed classes, but it claims only an entrance into those temples. I will mention a few of them. The most important of them are in Southern India. In Trichinopoly a temple was built on the ground where Sambava Samban was cremated. We were driven away from it and the temple was re-named Jambukeswaram temple. In Tanjore a temple was built by Shola Raja over the ground where Biruvadai Samban was cremated. It may be traced to the Chola Magatham. It is now called Brahadേശwaraswami temple. The next temple at Tiruvarur was also built by the same Shola Raja on the ground where Thyagan of Thayaga Samban was cremated, whose (Thygan's) daughter the Raja married. That temple is now called Tyagarajaperumal temple. When the Mahratta and Telugu rajas or chiefs came to the South India, they destroyed forts of Sambans and took possession of these temples and drove the Sambans out of them. Again in Tanjore the Mariamman temple was built by the very Shola Raja. Mariamman was a sister of Tiruvalluvar, it was built in honour of that virtuous woman. I can quote hundreds and hundreds of temples like these. Such temples were taken possession of by caste people and we were driven out of them. According to this resolution we do not claim for the restoration of those

1st November 1932] [Mr. R. Srinivasan]

temples but want to claim merely entry into them just to worship the images. With regard to the temples in which there are samadhis or cemeteries, the Brahmans do not worship the images therein. So the Brahmans have no place in Jambukeswaram, Biratheswara or Tyagaraja temples. So they don't use the old names of our forefathers but attach the word Eswara and call them as Eswara temples. I do not want to go still further. We have claims to enter into the temples. Now our hon. Friend, Sir Patro, who has been advocating removal of untouchability when he began to talk on temple entry came out in his true colour. There is an old saying, Sir, 'Scratch a Russian, you will find a tartar'."

Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. PATRO:—"On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I am afraid my friend has entirely misunderstood me. I said that all temples that can be opened to-day must be opened. I never said anything against."

Rao Bahadur R. SRINIVASAN:—"Some of the speakers including Sir 4-15 Patro referred to our conditions saying that we were unclean and so on. P.m. If our conditions are wretched and if we have been unclean persons, as some people look upon us, how were we able to produce so many saints, so many poets and poetesses, such as Nandanar, Tiruvalluvar, Avvai and Mariamman who were models of virtue? Our community has produced dozens and dozens of saints and sages in the past. Poverty may drive them to be unclean. But when a depressed class woman wants to go and worship in a temple situated within her own locality or cheri, even though she has got only one saree, she takes particular care to wash and wear it before she goes into the temple. When such is the case, to charge the depressed classes that they will enter the temple, if allowed, in an unclean state, to say that they are dirty, they are this, they are that, is merely to deny them the opportunities and the privileges due to them. But, when you take the caste people who enter temples and examine their cases how far they are clean and so on, it will reveal several things into which I do not want to enter because it will create ill-feeling. They are well known to all.

"As for safeguards against breaches of peace, etc., when temple-entry is allowed, I do not think the depressed classes will create disturbances in the temples, because they are essentially peace-loving people more so in a spiritual atmosphere. I do not know what other safeguards are necessary than that guarantee. The very removal of the disability will create concord and bring in an era of peace. Then again, if you want to improve a community economically and politically, you should also improve them spiritually. Some of the speakers said that temple-entry is not so important a thing in elevating the community. Anyhow, according to the Poona Pact, temple-entry is one of the terms, I think they have rightly taken it as a first step to fulfil the pact. I do not want to take much of the time of the House. It is quite reasonable after all that was said that temple-entry should at once be recognized, especially as some of the oldest temples have been taken away from our possession. I hope this resolution will be passed unanimously by the House."

[1st November 1932]

* Khan Bahadur P. KHALIF-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“ Mr. President, Sir, I did not propose to intervene in the debate, but the long speech of my hon. Friend, Sir A. P. Patro, has induced me to rise up and say a few words. In his own able way, he told us that the depressed classes are certainly entitled in every way to enter the temples, that they are entitled to so many other rights and privileges, but at the same time he finished his long speech by saying that he cannot lend his support to the very modest resolution that is before the House. (Sir A. P. Patro: ‘It is not that.’) My hon. Friend has been talking in such a way that most of us have not been able to understand him. I would request him to make speeches in future in an understandable manner. (Laughter.)

“ Coming to the point, Sir, the depressed classes are still considered, at least by a majority of the Hindus, to be Hindus in religion, though some Hindus would deny them even that privilege. I for one consider them to be Hindus, and I cannot at all see why they should be kept out of so many privileges which the other Hindus are enjoying and are enjoying as they think as a matter of right. The poor depressed class man is prevented and sometimes forcibly prevented, from walking up a public street, where even the pig is freely permitted to wander about. Why should he be so prevented? What reason can the street people give for so preventing one of their own Hindu brethren? This is a matter in which the public are entitled to seek a remedy.

“ Coming to the question of political improvement, I may say that through the good graces of the British Government they have equality in the political temples. Now we see them in the local bodies. When representation was granted to them in local bodies, there were instances in olden days when boards refused to meet if the depressed class man would come and attend the board meeting. That was only ten years ago. But to-day, I ask, is there any single board which refused to meet because a depressed class man is a councillor here or member there? If such a great improvement has taken place within the last ten years, I ask, is it because public opinion was trained first to take them in, or because it was legislation that forcibly introduced them into those bodies, which gave the public the necessary education to consider them to be equal with the other Hindus. My hon. Friend, Sir Patro, said we must wait till public opinion is evolved to hold the depressed classes as equal to other members of the Hindu community. I would humbly submit to this House that I would rather prefer legislation being made to make them equal, and I am sure that thereby within a few years the distinction between depressed classes and non-depressed classes will disappear without any trace whatsoever. Again, as regards the public opinion to which my hon. Friend was referring, I would ask him whose public opinion he was referring to. Is it the public opinion of the non-depressed Hindus or the public opinion of the depressed classes? So far as I am able to understand, both the

1st November 1932] [Mr. P. Khalif-ul-lah]

representatives of the depressed classes and the representatives of the non-depressed classes have come to a pact at Poona and have also resolved at a conference at Bombay that all those disabilities should disappear. Does it not convey to us an idea of the present development in the public opinion of the depressed classes and the non-depressed classes? If they do not reflect the public opinion of those two communities, then am I not going to attach any weight to the representative character of those representatives at all, or to the public support that the pact has been receiving from all parts of India, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin? Now, Sir, as I have said, political equality has been achieved not by the development of public opinion but by legislation, which certainly quickened public opinion in its train. So also, Sir, in the matter of temple-entry, as my hon. Friend, Mr. Srinivasan, pointed out, temples which have been built in the names of Adi-Dravida saints have now been taken possession of by non-Adi-Dravidas, and into these temples the very Adi-Dravidas are refused entry by them. This is a matter in which the public are interested. A temple is certainly not a private place. If at all any legislation is to be introduced, it is here that we must make a start. Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar referred to the Tiruvalluvar temple in Mylapore. There to-day caste-Hindus go and worship in the name of the Adi-Dravida saint whose cremation took place there. Even his works known as Tirukural are considered to be the Tamil vedas. If the work of an Adi-Dravida is to be considered the very vedas of the Tamilians, I wonder how the Hindus can refuse the entry into a public temple to the Adi-Dravidas at all.

“As I said, the Poona Pact has brought things to a head. Either it must be a reformation or a revolution. Either you must bend or break. There is danger ahead. If now non-depressed classes do not realize the situation and grant to the depressed classes their birthright of equality as human beings, I am sure they will break away from them, and that is the danger ahead. It is high time that the non-depressed Hindus feel this as a vital matter touching their very community, the entire Hindu community at large. I feel no doubt whatsoever that enlightened Hindus will realize the situation and come to the rescue and save themselves, and by doing so, I say, they will be saving themselves besides saving the depressed classes also.”

* Rao Sahib N. SIVA RAJ:—“Mr. President, a very simple and straight issue that this resolution seeks to raise has unfortunately been clouded by the many speeches that have been made in which I find that matters that were entirely extraneous and not germane to the proper appreciation of this question had been introduced. As I see it, Sir, the object of this resolution is merely to remove a legal disability which exists in the case of certain temples whose authorities are prepared on the stress, on the pressure of public opinion to throw open temples to all Hindus. I maintain that even as long as there is one Hindu who is called a Hindu and who is recognized as such, as long as there is one Hindu who is not admitted into the temples, it is necessary for the legislature to express its opinion in favour of public opinion,

[Mr. N. Siva Raj]

[1st November 1932]

when that public opinion wants to admit him into the temple. Sir, it is quite unnecessary for us to discuss the merits of this question. I am luckily myself in the happy position of one who does not know either the texts or the traditions behind this question, and I am not prepared with that authority to say one way or the other in this matter of temple-entry. But I do maintain this, Sir, that as long as one Hindu is kept out of the Hindu temple it is very necessary that this legislature ought to assert itself in favour of public opinion for admitting that Hindu into the temple. Sir, that was the simple issue raised by Dr. Subbarayan's resolution which has been clouded by speeches in many cases ranging over the whole question of the entry of the depressed classes into temples. I do not say there is any case which is unfavourable for the entry of the depressed classes into the temples. Sir, I do not see why even the Government should stand in the way of legislation of the kind if and when it comes. As it at present stands, Dr. Subbarayan's resolution merely asks the consent of this House and to make a recommendation to the Government that if and when legislation is brought enabling this legal disability to be removed, which merely stands as an obstacle in the way of public opinion merely asserting itself, in such a case the Government also ought to have no objection to it. In a case like this I expect the Government merely to state that the Government shall have no objection whatsoever to the passing of any legislation which will remove any legal disability, when public opinion is for the removal of such disability. It is from that point of view that I have very great pleasure in supporting the resolution that has been moved by my hon. Friend, Dr. Subbarayan. That does not however mean that I am advocating temple-entry on the merits of the question. I know as matter of fact that in any case there is a kind of calculated degradation that has been thrown upon the depressed classes. Many of them are really thinking of adopting a new creed, a creed which is gradually growing in the minds of the depressed classes, namely, the creed of self-respect, by which they really do not want to have anything to do with temples as they exist at present and with the temple worship as is conducted at the present day. I ask my Hindu friends this: if there is a God in these temples, as long as they recognize worship in these temples not directly to that God but through an intermediary, through some other person, I do not think the question of temple-entry will be finally solved, even as regards the non-Brahmans are concerned.

4-30
p.m.

“ Another point that I wish to impress upon the minds of friends here is that the removal of untouchability is not going to achieve very much. I am in agreement with my hon. Friend, Sir A. P. Patro, when he said that this resolution ought to be divested of those safeguards with which it is sought to be hedged in. If I am for temple-entry at all, I am for it as a man who wants to have direct communion with God. I do not want to enter into any place where I may be told my place. That was why I said that I agreed with Sir A. P. Patro, and I am perfectly sure he was sincere when he said that. (Sir A. P.

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [1st November 1932]

of no use at all. We know that cases of breaches of the Sarda Act were taken to the Courts and the persons responsible for the offences were punished. The provisions of the Act would have been enforced more strictly, were it not for our political troubles. The Government felt somewhat nervous to enforce this Act strictly and thus add to the forces arrayed against them. That is one of the reasons why the Government have been somewhat hesitating in regard to the effective enforcement of the Act.

"I want this resolution to be passed for two reasons, both in the interest of the caste-Hindus as well as in the interests of the depressed classes. I say it is in the interest of the caste-Hindus because it would not do for them to treat the depressed classes as Hindus for one purpose and reject them for another purpose. They should not play this double game, and they should not widen the gulf between them. I think that action on the lines indicated in this resolution would be useful for the depressed classes. We all know that the temples and the idols we worship are calculated to improve our ideas of culture, etc. Animal sacrifice, offerings of toddy, etc., will not be permitted in temples like Chidambaram, Tanjore, Tirupati and other temples. These things will have ennobling influence on the depressed classes for the better. I think these people who want to go into the temples will derive benefit rather than be at a disadvantage.

"So much has been said about *sastras*. I am sure that, if the aid of the Pandits are invoked, you can find authorities both in favour of temple entry and against it. I think we need not attach very great importance to *sastras*, because, as we make progress, customs must go away to suit the changing conditions from time to time.

3-15
p.m

"I would only urge this consideration for our Hindu brethren to bear in mind, that is, that those who believe in *sastras* and accept them as authorities base their objections on the impurity of these poor people. I think, Sir, ignorance can certainly be fought by propaganda and education. Surely, the Gods that are being worshipped are capable of taking care of their purity, and God will not be polluted by the approach of any of the creatures that God himself has created. I therefore wish earnestly to associate myself with the proposition moved by my hon. Friend."

* Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"Mr. President, Sir, I am extremely thankful to Dr. Subbarayan for having brought forward this resolution before the Council. The resolution itself is very mild and moderate. No wonder that Dr. Subbarayan who was taking great interest in all the communities when he was a Minister thought it best to bring forward this resolution immediately an opportunity came. I am however very sorry that my Friend, Sir Patro, took the attitude that he did and spoke in a rather patronizing way. Adi-Dravidas should not be looked upon in a patronizing way; we should not say 'let us give them this, let us give them that.' Only this morning the resolution regarding the suffix 'Achari' was forced on us; and the

[Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo] [1st November 1932]

higher power of divinity in them should be worshipped by people having inferior divinity. That is why you find that Guru is considered as God himself. Image worship is a relic of the old custom. Today I may regard a certain gentleman as my Guru; afterwards I may find fault with him and may not regard him as worthy of worship. The worship of images would obviate all that. It is not intended for people most advanced either religiously or intellectually. If worship of images is intended for any at all, it is for the backward classes. Especially as the Brahmans think they are highly advanced both spiritually and intellectually and they consider that the so-called depressed classes are not so far advanced as they are, I think these depressed classes have a prior right to worship in the temple.

“That is one point. We call God Patitapavana—a person who rescues fallen people. If you consider these people as fallen people and God is Patitapavana, on that ground also these people have a prior right to worship in these temples. Then the third thing is evolution. You say every animal has got a right to be saved, that is, to Moksha. Man is superior to other animals. Supposing a rat or a cat goes into the temple and into the Garbhagriham, do you say that the image there is polluted? Man attains this state after going through a number of births; he is a human avatar as I would call it. I do not see any reason for any one saying that the entry of certain man into the temple pollutes the idol therein, but not the entry of a cat or rat. That is the evolution theory.

“Another thing I would submit is this. In these days, so long as people are really spiritually minded it matters very little whether they can get entry into the temple or not. The entry is claimed for these people, not because of their religious feeling but because of the fact that they should have equality of status with other caste. There is of course what I may call a label of inferiority attached to these classes. That label should be removed. How to remove it? First by allowing temple entry. If the temples are prepared to take them, that label will be removed first.” (Hear, hear.)

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“Before the Government come to a decision on the questions raised in this resolution, the Government wish to have the opinion of this House. In order that the Government may be helped with a decision of this House, the Government do not wish to take part in the voting of this resolution—that is, neither the Government Members in the Reserved Half nor the nominated official Members will take part in the voting. The Government will be very glad to have the assistance of a decision on these questions by this House before Government themselves come to a decision on the several questions involved in this.”

* Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—“Mr. President, I am more than gratified with the result of my modest resolution. I myself was rather afraid that the opinion of the orthodox community in this House might be ranged against it, but I am glad to find that every one has supported this resolution.

1st November 1932] [Dr. P. Subbarayan]

"Doubts have been thrown whether Sir Patro really supported the resolution. I am glad to find that he is wholly in support of this resolution. I am only surprised, Mr. President, that the leaders of the party in power, none of the Ministers, deigned to take part in this debate. It is rather surprising that on a first-class issue of this kind they should have given no lead to their party. But I hope that by their vote at least they will show their sympathy for this resolution. I can understand the speech made by the hon. the Law Member, because the hon. the Law Member, whatever may be his personal opinion, is bound by certain traditions of the Government and therefore, as a Member of the Reserved Half he could certainly not exercise freedom; and I am glad that he has said that the official Members of the Government are going to take no part in this voting and that he is going to watch what the opinion of this House would be on this matter. I hope this neutral attitude does not really mean that they are going to maintain a sphinx-like neutrality even when the House has given its opinion on the matter which I hope will be unanimous, but that they will see their way to introduce legislation as early as possible. A great deal can be done by the Transferred Half; the Religious Endowments Act is entirely in their charge. It is section 40 of that Act that stands in the way, and I hope that they will take steps to have this amended so that permission may be given to these people to enter the temples.

"I think it was Sir A. P. Patro who talked of the economic condition of these people. We are very sorry for the economic condition of these people and I think that could be removed by raising their standards of living. I think every one of us not only the Hindu but also people belonging to other castes are interested in the uplift of these classes of people. I was glad to hear the speech of my hon. Friend, Mr. Yakub Hasan, and I hope he was voicing the sentiments of the Muslim community. My hon. Friend, Mr. Khalif-ul-lah, also supported his friend, Mr. Yakub Hasan. If we want to call ourselves Nationalists and if we are going to build the future Constitution of this country, it is but right that we should endeavour in every possible way to unite together on this question of temple entry. Of course it may be a minor question to some, but I do not think it so because if we are united together on this question, the very degradation will disappear. If we think that they are fit enough to enter into the temples, it is but right that they should enjoy all the other rights which other communities enjoy in this land. Mr. President, I hope this resolution of mine will be carried by a unanimous vote of this House."

The amendment was put and carried.

The resolution, as amended, was put and declared carried.

A poll was demanded and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. K. P. Raman Menon. | 4. Rao Sahib N. Siva Raj. |
| 2. " G. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 5. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappa |
| 3. " M. Devadasan. | Bahadur. |

[1st November 1932]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 6. Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar. | 31. Mr. V. P. Narayanan Nambiyar. |
| 7. Mr. B. P. Sesha Reddi. | 32. „ M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar. |
| 8. „ P. V. Rajagopala Pillai. | 33. Ahmed Miran Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. „ V. G. Vasudeva Pillai. | 34. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. |
| 10. „ C. Indriah. | 35. „ K. Koti Reddi. |
| 11. „ P. Bayappa Reddi. | 36. „ C. R. Parthasarathi Ayyangar. |
| 12. Rao Sahib V. Dharmalingam Pillai. | 37. „ F. G. Luker. |
| 13. Raja of Bobbili. | 38. „ F. J. Stanes. |
| 14. Raja of Kallikote. | 39. Rai Sahib C. Kolanda Reddi. |
| 15. Zamindar of Mirzapuram. | 40. Mr. C. Satyanarayana Choudari. |
| 16. Mr. M. A. Muthiah Chettiyar. | 41. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro. |
| 17. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 42. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. |
| 18. „ H. B. Ari Gowder. | 43. Mr. C. Basu Dev. |
| 19. Rao Sahib P. Subrahmanyam Chetti. | 44. Diwan Bahadur S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 20. Mr. S. A. A. Annamalai Chettiyar. | 45. Rao Sahib D. Krishnamurti. |
| 21. Zamindar of Kirlampudi. | 46. Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur. |
| 22. Mr. D. V. Narasimhaswami. | 47. Mr. G. Sriramulu. |
| 23. „ A. Harischandrudu. | 48. „ H. M. Jagannatham. |
| 24. „ K. Kesava Ramamurti Nayudu. | 49. Rao Sahib V. I. Muniswami Pillai. |
| 25. Sriman M. G. Patnaik Mahasayo. | 50. Rao Bahadur R. Srinivasan. |
| 26. Dr. P. Subbarayan. | 51. Mr. G. R. Premayya. |
| 27. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Ayyar. | 52. „ G. Lakshmana Reddi. |
| 28. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalingam Chettiyar. | 53. Mrs. K. Alamelumangathayaramma. |
| 29. Khan Bahadur P. Kalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 54. Rao Bahadur G. Jagannadha Raju. |
| 30. B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur. | 55. Pandit Ganala Ramamurti. |
| | 56. Mr. Abdul Hameed Khan. |

Neutral.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir Mahmomed Usman Sahib Bahadur. | 9. Mr. H. M. Hood. |
| 2. „ Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar. | 10. „ R. Madanagopal Nayudu. |
| 3. „ Sir Archibald Campbell. | 11. „ S. H. Slater. |
| 4. „ Mr. H. G. Stokes. | 12. „ E. Conran Smith. |
| 5. „ Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar. | 13. „ T. Sundara Rao Nayudu. |
| 6. „ Mr. P. T. Rajan. | 14. Khan Bahadur Syed Tajuddin Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. Mr. C. E. Jones. | 15. Mr. Mahboob Ali Baig. |
| 8. „ J. A. Thorne. | 16. „ K. M. Duraiswami Reddi. |
| | 17. „ W. K. M. Langley. |
| | 18. „ W. P. A. Soundara Pandian. |
| | 19. S. M. K. Beyabani Sahib Bahadur. |

Ayes 56. Neutral 19.

The resolution was carried.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

IV.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

1. ¹ U.O. Note No. 22792-2, Public (General), dated 19th October 1932, with reference to question No. 149 answered on 5th August 1932.
2. ² U.O. Note No. 22785-2, Public (General), dated 18th October 1932, with reference to question No. 82 answered on 3rd August 1932.
3. ³ U.O. Note No. 22788-2, Public (General), dated 19th October 1932, with reference to question No. 85 answered on 3rd August 1932.

¹ Printed as Appendix VIII on page 267 infra.² Printed as Appendix IX on page 268 infra.³ Printed as Appendix X on page 269 infra.